

allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of independent claim 30 and dependent claim 31.

Independent claim 30 claims attempting to place a main application processor in a suspend state and removing voltage to the main application processor without a reset attempt if the attempt to place the processor in the suspend state fails. Hosaka et al. use a “watch dog timer” to diagnose operation of a CPU (col. 3, lines 36-37). When the CPU malfunctions or stops, the timer indicates an error processing program or, in an emergent case, cuts off the power supply (col. 3, lines 37-39). The Examiner further alleges that “a malfunctioned CPU is a run-away CPU, a CPU that does not respond to a command. Placing a CPU in a suspend state is a command to the CPU. If the CPU fails to enter the suspend state, the CPU is malfunction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cut off the power to the CPU as taught by Hosaka when the CPU fails to enter the suspend state.

Hosaka et al. use a specific controller for controlling input/output devices, such as office automation or factory automation devices (col. 1, lines 11-19). There is no suggestion that the controller of Hosaka et al. even has a suspend state. Hosaka et al. do not disclose or suggest any state other than running or power off. The Examiner assumes the existence of the suspend command. However, there is no suggestion to place the CPU of Hosaka et al. in a suspend state or even to issue that particular command. Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable.

Hosaka et al. turn the power off when the CPU malfunctions in an emergency. There is no specific tie between an attempt to enter a suspend state and turning off the power were the attempt to enter the suspend state fails. Turning off power for malfunction is not disclosure of the specific turning off power for failure to enter the suspend state of claim 30. Disclosing the genus is not disclosure of the species. In other words, disclosing turning off power for a malfunction is not disclosure of turning off power for a failure to enter a suspend state. Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable.

Hosaka et al. use the removal of power in an emergency. There is no suggestion that the removal of power is done without a reset attempt. The very act of only removing in an emergency may indicate that power is removed only after other attempts to fix the CPU are

made. In fact, Hosaka et al. suggests that an error processing program is applied (col. 3, lines 37-39). A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have removed the voltage without a reset attempt based on the disclosure of Hosaka et al., so claim 30 is allowable.

Dependent claim 31 is allowable for the same reasons noted above for independent claim 30. Claim 31 further claims a suspend-to-RAM state. Hosaka et al. use an on state and a power off state, so do not suggest a suspend-to-RAM state.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4726.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig A. Summerfield
Registration No. 37,947
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: January 5, 2005